

## REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 14-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1-11 and 14-24 have been rejected. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended. Claims 5, 12, 13, 17, and 24-33 have been canceled without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

On January 31, 2008, Examiner Wu conducted an Examiners Interview with the undersigned. The cited prior art of Gusack and Angus were discussed, as well as potential amendments that could put the pending claims in condition for allowance. The undersigned proposed amendments to the Examiner on February 15, 2008.

On March 3, 2008, the Examiner telephoned the undersigned and suggested incorporating the substance of dependent claim 5 into independent claim 1 to place claim 1 in condition for allowance. Further, the Examiner suggested incorporating the substance of dependent claims 17 and 24 into independent claim 14 to place claim 14 in condition for allowance. The Applicant amends claims 1 and 14 as the Examiner suggests to expedite prosecution. While the Applicant respectfully presents the arguments below to show that the claims would be allowable even without amendment, the claims as amended are clearly allowable.

The Applicant maintains that neither Gusack nor Angus, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of the independent claims 1 and 14. As set forth in earlier Responses, and as set forth below, the cited references at least do not disclose a two-part keyword, associated with data in a file storage system, as claimed in claims 1 and 14.

Claim 1 requires a keyword with two parts. One part is a **parameter** that describes certain data, as follows:

- (i) a parameter comprising a first portion of the keyword, the parameter identifying the data, the parameter describing an attribute of the data;

Another part is a **parameter value** that represents a quantity associated with the parameter, as follows:

(ii) a parameter value comprising a second portion of the keyword, the parameter value representing a particular quantity associated with the parameter;

An example of such a claimed keyword would be [VOLUME; 25 ml], where “VOLUME” is the parameter, and “25 ml” is the parameter value. For this example, the keyword is the pairing of VOLUME and 25 ml. The Applicant submits that neither Gusack nor Angus, alone or in combination, teaches a keyword with such an arrangement of these two parts.

#### Gusack – U.S. Patent No. 6,356,897

The Examiner points to Gusack fig. 15 and col. 19, lines 28-59 to teach a keyword with a first portion and a second portion, a parameter in the first portion, the parameter identifying the data and the parameter describing an attribute of the data. However, the Applicant clearly sets forth, in the response to the first office action (July 12, 2006), why Gusack does not teach such a keyword. The cited text from Gusack describes words highlighted in a text field, which are listed with L# fields in a hypertext word index. In the example provided in fig. 15, the highlighted word is “QUALITY.” But Gusack does not teach or suggest incorporating the highlighted word into a keyword with first and second parts as the Examiner asserts. Nor does Gusack teach or suggest associating a parameter value to this highlighted word, as claims 1 and 14 recite. The L# field merely points to a particular record in the text data table, but has no parameter value aspect, as is required by the claims. Thus, Gusack provides no parameter identifying data, nor does Gusack provide a parameter describing an attribute of the data, as the claims require.

#### Angus – U.S. Patent No. 7,003,504

The Examiner asserts that Gusack does not explicitly teach, “parameter value and representing a particular quantity associated with the parameter,” nor does Gusack teach the final two limitations (wherein . . ., and retrieving . . .) of claim 1. The Applicant agrees that Gusack does not teach these limitations, but the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion that Angus supplies that which is missing from Gusack. As described above, claim 1 requires a

keyword with two parts, among other requirements. The combination of Gusack and Angus does not teach this keyword.

Angus is directed to a data processing system for storing and managing multiple data entries, where the data processing system employs a data structure that allows the storage and management of a vast number of interrelated data entries, the interrelations of which change over time. Thus, Angus is concerned with storing data in a particular structure, and outputting data in a particular format. Angus is not concerned with using keywords to query the data structure. Thus, Angus does not teach or suggest keywords, and certainly not keywords that include two parts as described above.

The Examiner refers to fig. 5 of Angus for that which is missing from Gusack. As described in the Response of September 4, 2007, fig. 5 of Angus merely depicts a dataset stored in the data processing system, comprising fields for holding the data in accordance with a certain schema. (col. 7, lines 49-52). Fig. 5 does not include a parameter, but rather includes fields for holding numeric values (e.g., [f]ield 55 holds a numeric value representing the volume of the transaction; col. 8, lines 1-2), and pointers pointing to characteristics of the numeric value (e.g., field 56 holds a pointer pointing to the record holding details of the unit in which the volume is measured; col. 8, lines 2-4). Since Angus only teaches a numeric value and the “units” of that numeric value, Angus does not teach or suggest the parameter and parameter value pairing as required by the claims. As the Applicant pointed out in the previous Response, it is the “parameter” itself of the parameter – parameter value pairing that is missing from Angus.

In the “Examiner’s remarks” section of the October 9, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner addresses the Applicant’s argument that, “what is missing from Angus is the parameter itself.” The Examiner references Angus col. 34, line 12 and col. 5, lines 34-35 as teaching a parameter. However, the “parameter” described in these citations are unrelated to the Examiner’s original reference to figure 5, and are also unrelated to the parameter of claims 1 and 14. At col. 5, lines 34-35, the term “parameter” refers to figure 19, which describes input parameters to be provided

by a user through a GUI (see also col. 17, lines 50-53). This text does not refer to a portion of a keyword, as the claims require.

At col. 34, line 12, the term “parameter” refers to the result of measurements during a chemical process. Those results are used as transaction data. However, neither the parameter nor the transaction data is part of a keyword, as required by claim 1.

Claim 1 further requires that the two parts of the keyword be associated with data in a file storage system, as follows:

wherein the parameter and the parameter value are associated with the data contained in the file storage system;

The Examiner refers to fig. 5 of Angus as teaching this limitation. However, nothing in fig. 5, nor in the accompanying text (col. 7, line 49 through col. 8, line 40) teaches or suggests a parameter and parameter value being associated with data contained in a file storage system, as required by claim 1.

Filed herewith is a Request for a Two-Month Extension of Time, which extends the statutory period for response to expire on March 9, 2008. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. No other fees are believed to be due in connection with

Application No. 10/672,943  
Amendment dated March 7, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of October 9, 2007

Docket No.: 0109204.00133US2

the filing of this response, however the Commissioner is authorized to debit Deposit Account No. 08-0219 for any required fee necessary to maintain the pendency of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 7, 2008

/Ronald R. Demsher/  
Ronald R. Demsher  
Registration No.: 42,478  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109  
(617) 526-6000 (telephone)  
(617) 526-5000 (facsimile)